***THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY***

***W.P.No.26 102 of 2005***

***Date:20.12.2005***

APSRTC Staff & Workers Union.

--------PETITIONER

The Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation and another.

---------RESPONDENTS

**ORDER:**

The petitioner is one of the Trade Unions of the Employees of A.P.S.R.T.C. Respondents have undertaken the process of verification, for the purpose of conferring the status of recognized unions. For this purpose, a meeting was held on 03.12.2005 in the Office of the Additional Commissioner of Labour. The petitioner and seven other unions have participated in it. Based on the discussion that had ensued therein, the 2nd respondent issued an election programme. The petitioner takes exception to certain steps indicated by the 2nd respondent. It opposes the procedure of conducting the elections through two ballot papers. Another objection is as regards the delay in publication of the voters' list.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Standing Counsel for the 1st respondent-Corporation and the learned Government Pleader for Labour.

A perusal of the minutes, dated 03.12.2005, prepared by the 2nd respondent, discloses that he has taken into account, the views expressed by the various participants in the meeting. The elections are being conducted as part of the obligation under the relevant Labour Laws, in accordance with the procedure

stipulated in the Code of Conduct. The process of verification through two ballot papers is not a phenomenon, which is introduced in the present exercise. It is in vogue since inception. While one ballot is earmarked for ascertaining the status of a union at local level, the other is meant to be used for the purpose of recognition at state level. The same is provided for under the Code of Conduct. It is true that the petitioner wanted the verification through one ballot paper. However, it is not stated as to how it could not have been possible to determine the status of unions at local level on the one hand and at state level on the other, through one ballot paper.

The other objection as to the delay in preparation of voters' list is equally untenable. The verification is confined to the employees and workers of APSRTC. It is neither subject to any fluctuation, nor would a trade union be in a position to tinker with it. Therefore, the objection raised by the petitioner cannot be sustained in law. The other subsidiary objections raised by it are equally untenable.

For the foregoing reasons, the Writ Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

**20.12.2005**

**Jsu**